

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Withdrawn Claims 36-51 have been cancelled, and may be the subject of a divisional application. Claims 52 and 53 are also cancelled.

Applicants acknowledge the examiner's courtesy in granting a personal interview with the undersigned attorney and Nitin Kaushik on November 30, 2006. Applicant concurs with the examiner's Interview Summary of November 30, 2006, in which the examiner deemed the present amendments to Claim 1 to distinguish that claim over the prior art. As such, dependent Claims 2-35 also distinguish over the prior art.


Further, Applicants point out that dependent Claims 2-35 recite further features of the invention so as to distinguish over the prior art with more force than Claim 1. For instance, the choices of adhesive or substrate materials recited in various dependent claims helps to avoid some or all of the problems mentioned in the Background of the Invention, while attaining some or all of the advantages mentioned in the Background of the Invention. Contrary to the Office Action of 19 October 2006, Applicants submit that selection of suitable adhesive or substrate materials to fulfill the foregoing purposes was not within the routine skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

In conclusion, the pending claims should be allowed.

I certify that the foregoing document and any document(s) referenced below are being filed electronically with the USPTO using the private PAIR system on the date stated below.

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Charles E. Bruzga
Registration No. 28,935
Customer No. 07617